REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 6 are independent claims. Claim 17 has been added. No new matter has been introduced.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zintel in view of Meyerson. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

Independent claim 1 recites, among other features, a network transmission judging unit configured to compare the read network transmission possible identifier with a preset network transmission possible identifier, to judge whether to perform network transmission of the device characteristic data according to a result of the comparison, and to selectively transmit the device characteristic data when the comparison result of the judging unit indicates the network transmission of the device characteristic data should be performed. Independent claim 6 includes similar features in a varying scope.

The Office Action acknowledges that Zintel does not disclose these features (see page 2 of the Office Action). Then, the Office Action states that the Abstract in Meyerson teaches these features of independent claims (see page 3 of the Office Action). The Office Action further states that Myerson teaches a method that enables a CP to automatically establish communications with these secondary devices through the use of advanced searching methods, and an ability to choose which devices and information are displayed to the user. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Meyerson teaches that "the central processing unit automatically establishes communication with the secondary devices through the transceiver by sequentially (or in parallel) attempting communication with the secondary devices using a plurality of known communication protocols until communications are established, and the central processing unit changes the user interface depending upon which secondary devices are in communication with the primary device." Hence, in Meyerson, if the central processing unit's attempt to communicate with the secondary devices is successful, the central processing unit will automatically communicate with the secondary devices. Therefore, the central processing unit in Meyerson does not selectively communicate with the secondary devices based on the result of comparing a read identifier and a preset identifier. Furthermore, the central processing unit in Meyerson does not have an ability to choose which devices and information are displayed to the user. Rather, Meyerson does not teach that the central

processing unit itself is not selective in communication but teaches that the communication with the secondary devices depends on successful attempts by the central processing unit. Therefore, Meyerson, even when combined with Zintel, fails to teach or suggest the features of independent claims 1 and 6.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 6 and each of the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

Claim Added

Independent claim 17 recites a combination of elements in a selective device recognition apparatus in a UPnP based home network including a network stream processing unit configured to parse a device characteristic data of a device and to read a network transmission possible identifier and a device characteristic identifier and a network transmission judging unit configured to compare the read network transmission possible identifier with a preset network transmission possible identifier, to judge whether to perform network transmission of the device characteristic data according to a result of the comparison, and to selectively transmit the device characteristic data when the comparison result of the judging unit indicates the network transmission of the device characteristic data should be performed, wherein the device characteristic data is transmitted by only a home network device recognizing the network transmission possible identifier. The feature "the device characteristic data is transmitted by only a home network device recognizing

the network transmission possible identifier" is supported at least by page 13, line 21 – page 14, line 2 of the specification. Applicant respectfully submits that this combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 17 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record.

Consideration and allowance of claim 17 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and in view of the above clarifying amendments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw all of the objections and rejections of record, and to provide an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters which need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Jun S. Ha (Registration No. 58,508) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: June 24, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASH & BIRCH, LLP

By _____ #39,538
Esther H. Chong, #40,953 JSH

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22032-0747
(703) 205-8000

EHC/JSH/jmc